



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/507,505 | 09/13/2004 | Takahisa Kaneko | 121107 | 6446 |
| 25944 | 7590 | 01/16/2007 | EXAMINER | |
| OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC | | | LEYSON, JOSEPH S | |
| P.O. BOX 19928 | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320 | | | 1722 | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 01/16/2007 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

8

| | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|-------------------------------|--|
| Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief | Application No. 10/507,505 | Applicant(s) KANEKO ET AL. | |
| | Examiner Joseph Leyson | Art Unit 1722 | |

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 26 December 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☒ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: see attachment. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 9-16 and 18.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attached.
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____.
13. ☐ Other: _____.

Art Unit: 1722

1. The amendments to the drawings filed on December 26, 2006 will NOT be entered because the changes give the appearance that the die 10 is composed of two parts or two plates which would be new matter.
2. Applicant's request for reconsideration in the remarks filed on December 26, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argue that Bagley (U.S. Patent 3,790,654) does not realize the problem associated with the use of a material having a high hardness because Bagley nominates aluminum as a possible material for die and that Bagley does not recognize the problems solved by the features recited in the claims. However, these arguments are assertions without any factual basis.

Applicants argue that the criticality of [1] the connection area has been demonstrated in data shown in Table 2 of the present application, [2] the height of the cell blocks has been demonstrated in data shown in Table 3, and [3] the material for die has been demonstrated in data shown in Table 1; and that, in this respect, the controlling effects of the deviation in the shape of the extruded honeycomb structure exceed the expected level of routine experiments. However, after reviewing the disclosure and Tables 1 to 3, the specification does not clearly disclose controlling effects of the deviation in the shape of the extruded honeycomb structure, or disclose how such would exceed the expected level of routine experiments. Therefore, this argument appears to be an assertion without any factual basis.

Applicants argue that Bagley does not render obvious the subject matter recited in the claims without realizing the criticality of the features, such as, "a connection area

Art Unit: 1722

ratio of the back hole and the cell block being 35 to 65%." (relative to cell block breakage as shown in Table 2). However, the connection area ratio is related to the dimensions of the die. Bagley discloses that the die construction should provide the required strength and rigidity to withstand extrusion pressures without failure or deleterious deformation, as mentioned in the previous office action. Thus, Bagley does realize the criticality of die construction (i.e., dimensions, materials, etc. of the die).

Applicants argue that Inoue, Comstock, Cocchetto, and JP-2000-326318 do not supply the subject matter lacking in Bagley. However, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See *In re Keller*, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986).

3. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Joseph Leyson whose telephone number is (571) 272-5061. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 9AM-5:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gupta Yogendra can be reached on (571) 272-1316. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1722

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.


JL


TIM HEITBRINK
PRIMARY EXAMINER
GROUP 130

1-11-07